

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSION ON PROBATION

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1926



BOSTON

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

COMMISSION ON PROBATION

STATE HOUSE, BOSTON

Chas. M. Davenport

CHARLES M. DAVENPORT, *Chairman*THOMAS H. DOWD
ALLISON G. CATHERONMISS MARY E. DRISCOLL
ARTHUR P. STONEHERBERT C. PARSONS, *Deputy Commissioner and Secretary*

Office, 175 Court House, Pemberton Square, Boston

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Report of the Deputy Commissioner	3
Legislative Concern over Crime	3
Legislation as to Probation	3
Expanded Use of Commission Records	4
Use of Probation Maintained	4
Offences of Persons Given Probation	4
Comparative Dispositions	5
Information for the Courts	5
Examinations of Prisoners	5
Access to Records not Public	6
Identification of Records	6
State of the Service	7
The Year in Review	7
Some Facts as to Probation	8
STATISTICAL TABLES	
Cases Placed on Probation:	
Table 1	9
Summary of Probation Cases in All Courts:	
Table 1	10
Cases Placed on Probation — Age Distribution:	
Table 2	10
Results of Probation:	
Table 3	11
Summary of Probation Results in All Courts:	
Table 4	12
Probation by Offences:	
Table 5	12
Probation Population:	
Table 6	13
Comparative Dispositions:	
Table 7	17
Releases by Probation Officers:	
Table 8	20
Collections by Probation Officers:	
Table 9	21
Cost of Probation Service:	
Table 10	23

364 M3
C73
1926
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
B

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

To the Honorable Commission on Probation:

I have the honor to submit my report as deputy commissioner for the year ending September 30, 1926, the eighteenth year of the Commission.

Legislative Concern over Crime

During the year probation as a method of dealing with offenders came to the sharpest test it has ever met, or is likely to meet, at the bar of public opinion. The courts were under attack. Sweeping charges that they were too lenient and too indifferent were made. It was not so much alleged as acclaimed, that the defences of life and property had been broken down by sentimental treatment of law-violators.

Public opinion, which normally is inert as to this feature of government, was inflamed. General indifference through the years had left the people uninformed and with no other belief than that the criminal courts of the state were performing their difficult duty in a way to deserve confidence. A prevalence of crimes of violence throughout the country was ample occasion for arousing common concern.

Massachusetts could not escape agitation over a "crime wave" which seemed to demand an overhauling of the methods of the courts. The attack took the form of arraying instances in which it was charged that violent offenders had been encouraged to go to the limit of crime by having been lightly dealt with for minor offences. Upon such alleged instances the demand was stoutly made that the discretion of the courts should be narrowed, that penalties should be made more severe and that such alternatives as probation and parole should be put under a rigidly restricted use.

Thus the issue came to the legislature of 1926. Its file of bills and petitions bulged with proposals for radical changes in the law. The whole situation as to crime came to review and the committee on the judiciary conducted what approached a crime week. Theories of criminology never had such examination nor criticism of the courts such a field day.

Legislation as to Probation

Any note of such an episode has its place in this report only as leading to the outcome in legislation as to the service your Commission represents. The general upshot was that probation was approved rather than hurt. Leaders at the bar came to its defence and support. The attorney general, after a study of the cases submitted to show errors in the court's dispositions of cases, reported that the serious fault was not in judgment but in lack of information as to the persons charged with crime. He proposed a compulsory use of the system of central records the Commission on Probation had built up. He was supported by district prosecutors in opposing any invasion of the courts' discretion in sentences.

The main outcome as to probation, as an instrument at the hand of the court, was that it was not discredited but rather given a new, because critical, approval. Out of 19 bills reported by the committee, probation was adversely affected in only two.

One of these enactments denied to judges of district courts the use of probation in felonies if the guilty person had previously been convicted of felony. It affected so few cases as not to be important and as it did not lessen the discretion of the superior court its restriction could be overcome by appeal which it seemed to invite.

The other act required probation officers to arrest and surrender any of their charges found guilty of an offence except drunkenness while on probation. This restriction of a vital discretion in probation officers is minor and how it will operate remains to be discovered as it went into effect only on September 1.

More important by far was the bill, which became law on the same date, reinforcing the central bureau of records by requiring that to it should be reported all paroles from state and county institutions adult and juvenile, to be entered on

the same personal records as were the court actions, and further requiring that in all cases where a person is charged with an offence punishable by more than a year's imprisonment the court shall avail itself of information in the possession of the Commission on Probation.

Expanded Use of Commission Records

Fortunately for the successful operation of the new law making your bureau of records a prescribed part of every court's system, the Commission had two years before made its daily gathering of records state-wide. In anticipation of the new demands likely to fall upon it, the office of the Commission was somewhat reorganized. Room 174 was closed to the public and made exclusively a file room, a larger telephone switchboard installed near the entrance of 175, telephone booths built in the file room, the cabinets rearranged with a view to growth and a speedy service, and the Commission's meeting room, which had taken half the space in 175, done away, the deputy commissioner's office being reduced to a smaller section.

The legislature granted additional money and the clerical force was increased. It is gratifying to report that the first month of the new order of things proved that the service was equal to the demands put upon it.

Meanwhile there had been a steady growth in the use of the records and by September the annual rate of inquiries had reached 108,000, as against 40,000 in the first year of the state-wide service.

Use of Probation Maintained

Agitation as to crime measures has not produced any marked effect on the extent of the use of probation as revealed by statistics. The number of persons placed on probation during the year was 30,934. The number in 1925 was 32,881; in 1924, the highest record in the Commission's records, 33,544. This decline would signify a new caution if it were not more than accounted for in the reduction in the number of drunkenness cases given probation. There were 13,576 of these in 1924, and this year 10,142. This reduction of 3,434 more than takes care of the loss in the probation total of 2,610.

Any reduction in the proportion of "drunks" placed on probation is cheering. In early days, they constituted about 75 per cent of the probation list. The 1924 percentage was 40.4; that of this year, 32.7. The poorest chance of bringing about improvement in probation is with the drunkard, unless it be with the feeble-minded. The state is moving towards a more effective method in each class, although without a clear light on its path as to the inebriate and without any too great certainty that it will recognize the feeble-minded until some more or less atrocious development in behavior reveals his need of a specialized care.

Offences of Persons Given Probation

With 68 per cent of probation cases arriving through some other offence than drunkenness, the table showing the offences (see appendix, Table 5) may have interest. It reveals more than 100 offending paths to probation. Offences against property lead, with such numbers as 3,208 for larceny and 1,008 for breaking and entering — two offences that in real life are less far apart than is commonly thought; 373 for unlawful appropriation, 222 for malicious injury, 126 for receiving stolen property.

Offences against good order follow, or if we unite the liquor law offenders, 2,747, and the motor vehicle offenders, 3,197, and add to them the gamblers, 315; the carriers of dangerous weapons, 119; the disturbers of the peace, 354, and the varied others, this group goes to the top. The violators of ordinances and rules follow numerously. The sex offenders scattered through the list, make a total of 700 or more.

Domestic cases do not reveal themselves adequately in the list of offences. There are 2,614 non-support cases; 302 neglect of family (a term often used for non-support); 160 neglect of children; 314 fathers of illegitimate children; 34 non-support of parents. This total of 3,424 new "domestic" cases is impressive but it does not give the full picture as a very large number of such cases are adjusted by probation officers without formal court action. The constantly growing total

of collections in non-support cases, this year reaching \$1,332,327.32, is more revealing.

Comparative Dispositions

The familiar test of the extent of resort to probation is the proportion of dispositions it forms. For years this has remained in the neighborhood of 25 per cent. It has, however, shown a decline in the most recent years — 23.6 per cent in 1924; 23.1 per cent in 1925; 22.7 per cent in 1926. There is a qualification of this index in the flood of cases that are disposed of by fines, 60,046 (44.2 of total dispositions) this year, and 33,377 cases filed (24.7 per cent of the total). (See Appendix, Table 7.)

The real comparison is between the probation and sentenced cases. The courts have been sentencing to imprisonment more numerous — doubtless in response to the current agitation. There was a year when only 55 out of 1,000 convicted persons were sentenced to imprisonment. In 1924, that number was 65; in 1925, it was 94; this year it reacts to 84.

Against this is to be placed the number placed on probation out of 1,000 convicted — 236 in 1924; 231 in 1925; 227 in 1926. The total commitments reached a peak in 1925, being 13,351, and dropped this year by 2,000, to 11,340.

Criminal statistics are swamped by the influx of motor vehicle offenders. Their number is so great as to give a fictitious total of what is called crime. Out of the mass, however, it is possible to extract this positive fact as to probation, that, with the reduction in the "drunk" cases, the courts are making constantly increasing use of their probation officers in their supervisory capacity.

Information for the Courts

By the addition of the personal records of parole to the Commission's records of criminal cases in the courts, the bureau becomes more than ever valuable. The probation officers are faithful, performing the duty of reporting cases daily. In a single instance of failure to do so, the attorney general at your request applied a prod which was effective. There have been murmurs of resentment of this additional burden in one or two instances. In courts distant from Boston it has been asked why minor records of persons who were never likely to be in another court and were perfectly well known at home should be sent this distance and added to a state file.

There are obviously items of court records which, taken singly, would be of slight interest or value to the central bureau, indeed of no value. The difficulty is to set any rule for selection. Often, as experience shows, what appears like a minor matter, of no interest outside the neighborhood, proves of distinct value when placed in a person's record with other offences. It may locate a person; it might supply a court with knowledge of repeated although not serious offending.

Moreover what constitutes a minor and what a major offence cannot be defined; even if it could be, there would still be a question what was of major and minor interest in a record. Certainly to open the door to discretion as to what records should and what should not be recorded is to defeat the end sought in a system that is proving highly valuable to the courts. It would have less value and distinctly less claim to confidence if it were fractional instead of complete.

The added burden placed upon probation officers in the daily reporting of cases is being met by the provision of clerical assistance to them. The courts have full authority to provide such assistance. In situations where clerical duties interfere with the duties of supervision the judges are showing readiness to lift the burden.

Examinations of Prisoners

The reports of the division for the examination of prisoners in the department of mental diseases are now a valuable addition to the information of the courts through your office. Two copies of the individual report are filed here. They are keyed to the file of court records so that upon inquiry for the record the probation officer is informed, in routine, that this report is available to the court and one copy will be loaned.

As this report includes a mental and physical examination and a full social investigation it is illuminating as to the former prisoner when he is again in court. The use of the reports is steadily increasing. There remain glaring instances

where a feeble-minded or a psychotic person is again given jail sentence or otherwise disposed of when a reading of this report would have presumably led the court to some other than such a futile dealing with the problem.

These case reports cannot fail to be of increasing possible value to the courts. The administration of law will be helped to the extent that their findings are turned to actual account, — assuming that administration of the law includes the disposition of a criminal case to the highest social advantage.

Access to Records Not Public

Massachusetts is the first state to accomplish the centralizing of records in criminal courts. Indeed it is the first state to undertake it. Its enterprise and the value of it in the administration of justice have attracted national attention and other states are considering similar undertakings. A difficulty they meet is that they lack such a state-wide organization as this state has in its probation officers in every court.

There are some 750,000 personal cards in this central file, some of them bearing many entries. The existence of such a reservoir of information naturally results in many requests from various quarters. Corporations, as to claimants, as to their applicants for employment and even as to their employees; insurance companies, in particular, as to applicants and claimants; private individuals, with a purely personal interest; most numerous, attorneys-at-law, as to their clients and as to witnesses they may wish to discredit; all these have had to learn that the records here are not public, in the sense of being open to all.

The Commission's rule that the information is available only to the courts and to authorized public officials is a necessary restriction both because to make it freely public would put a great burden on the system and because the outlay is made by the Commonwealth for a distinct official purpose. They are not original records, which, of course, are open to the public in the offices of the clerks in the respective courts. It has even been found necessary to point out that they do not constitute an additional criminal record; that it does not add to the seriousness of a record that it is transmitted to this office; even though it does add to the availability of the record to the courts to their fuller knowledge as to the offender with whom they deal.

By the observance of this rule, there has come about an understanding of the reasons for refusal of access which tends to reduce the frequency of futile requests, although it is not yet unusual for attorneys to make them more or less insistently on the ground that they are "officers of the court." Another precaution is against telephone inquiries without positive identification, there having been instances of false impersonation.

Identification of Records

The apprehension that records would be misapplied, — that is, that they would be used against another person than the one by whom they were acquired, — proves to be unsubstantial. Only to have a name, or to have with it the age and address, is obviously insufficient. There are hundreds of persons of identical name and among them there are instances of nearly or quite identical age and even of address. When, however, are added other facts such as occupation, height, weight, and complexion, and, most valuably, the names of parents and of wife or husband, the chances of error are reduced to a minimum.

It is gratifying, in experience, to find that cases of mistaken or even doubtful identity are rare. It is indeed surprising that with the readiness with which arrested persons give false names, requiring an elaborate cross-indexing under aliases, identification is seldom missed or mistaken. The nearly uniform gathering by the probation officer of all the identifying facts specified brings the system very nearly to the accuracy and certainty of finger-prints, which Massachusetts steadily refuses to require of persons accused of crime or even of those convicted and not committed to institutions.

It is now common for the courts to place upon its warrants and summonses to accused persons the direction that the defendant shall report to the probation officer before the hearing of his case. It is only so that it can be made certain that the identifying facts can be secured. In the rush of the motor-vehicle session,

for example, if the inquiry is not made in advance, the offender may make a speedy departure having left only his name on record. Certain courts, unfortunately including some of the largest, still leave this matter to chance — and the chance is a poor one.

It may yet be necessary to meet this situation by legislation in order to insure the requisite efficiency of the system; but it is to be hoped that full co-operation in requiring the information to be given preliminary to arraignment may be secured without resort to statute.

State of the Service

With the development of the investigation side of the probation service, which has marked recent years, there is often heard a question if it is not reducing the attention of the officers to supervision of their cases. If it were true, and to the extent that it were true, probation as a correctional process would be missing its main design. Failure in supervision is outright defeat. The reliance of the courts upon probation in lieu of commitment does not lessen. The number of cases to be supervised grows with each year. Coincident with its increase, comes steady increase of demand for prior investigation.

To meet the somewhat conflicting demands upon the officers, the obvious resort would be to an increased number of officers. But it is not the common resort. The number of officers does not grow proportionately to their burden.

The situation is met in some measure by the increase of clerical assistance. Up to 1914, there was not a clerk in any Superior Court probation office; one was appointed that year in Suffolk county. There is now no Superior Court office, except the smallest one, in which there is not clerical assistance. The number of the clerks in this branch is now 19. These are, for practical purposes, equivalent to such a number of added probation officers. They relieve the officers for the performance of their serious duties. In the municipal and district courts, the service now numbers 46 clerks, in contrast to 12 ten years ago.

Even this relief of the officers from routine record-keeping does not fully meet the need. There are impossible situations in the number of convicted persons an officer is expected to supervise. To the credit of the service, it can truthfully be claimed that they so organize their work as to approach the degree of oversight needed. In places where officers undertake to care single-handed for an average number of 250 on probation, there are fine examples of the use of other agencies to supplement and aid them. This cannot be claimed as a full substitute, however, in view of the responsibility not being transferable from the officer's shoulders. Volunteer officers have completely vanished from the probation list, for obvious reasons, and the substitution of even social-agency help is only a measurable improvement. The number of probation officers is still far short of sufficient for a hundred-per-cent performance of the duties.

It is not to be said, however, that the increase of investigation, which the courts have consistently demanded, has of itself diverted the officers from supervision to a marked extent. The officers would not individually subscribe to that statement. They think otherwise. They fail to give themselves due credit. A careful study of the service on this point fails to disclose an instance where it can be said that supervision has been relaxed because the officer had to be busy with investigation. The truth is that standards of supervision are higher; that more is exacted by the courts and the public as to the thoroughness of oversight; and that the real basis for a reasonable demand for additional officers is that supervision has never yet risen uniformly throughout the state to the thoroughness the public interest demands.

The Year in Review

Many facts as to the probation service which are somewhat obscure in statistical tables are extracted and given in paragraphic form on following pages. The tables have again been revised and reduced in detail, without sacrificing general facts. Comment upon certain continuing features, made in the Commission's past reports, is not repeated here although having application to this year's situation.

The Commission has lost from its membership Hon. John Perrins, its senior member in point of service and a devoted counsellor throughout twelve years.

As his successor Chief Justice Hall appointed Hon. Arthur P. Stone who brings to the board the rich experience of his connection as special justice and justice with the Third District Court of Eastern Middlesex, one of the busiest and most progressive of the state's courts.

Several changes have occurred in the list of probation officers, as appears further on in this report. The present corps represents in its service of the public's interest, through its devotion to its exacting tasks, an accomplishment that deserves high commendation and confidence.

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT C. PARSONS,
Deputy Commissioner.

SOME FACTS AS TO PROBATION

The total number of persons placed on probation (after conviction) in all the courts during the year was 30,934. Of these, 23,989 were men; 2,862 women; 3,734 boys (under 17); 349 girls.

The number of women placed on probation increases year by year. The total for women and girls, this year, was 3,211. Of these 865 were in courts having no woman probation officer.

The total number of probation officers in the 88 courts is 174. Of these 139 are men, 35 women. Of the 88 courts, 20 have women officers, 68 have only men.

Collections by probation officers from persons on probation were \$1,828,111.28. (Table 9.) The amount increases annually. The increase this year is \$95,000 over 1925, and \$227,000 over 1924.

The total cost to the counties of the probation service was \$448,438.38. In 1925 it was \$430,545.33. The collections were \$1,339,673 more than the cost of the service.

During the year 2,378 probationers were surrendered by the probation officers. This is just under 8 per cent of the number placed on probation. The highest percentage is in the Superior Courts (11.4%). In the Boston Municipal court it is 10 per cent; in the Boston courts as a whole 8.4 per cent; in the Boston Juvenile 6 per cent; in the district courts outside Suffolk county about 7 per cent.

Practically 8 out of 10 persons on probation conducted themselves satisfactorily, complied with the orders of the court, and were discharged at the end of the probation period. One out of ten failed and was surrendered for some other disposition of his case.

The Suffolk Superior probation office collected the largest sum of any one court, — \$202,316.69. Of this, over \$154,000 was for the support of families.

Arrests for drunkenness in state during the year were 78,248. In 1925, the arrests were 80,079. In 1924, there were 85,172. Probation officers released, this year, 33,628 or 42.9 per cent.

In some jurisdictions, no releases of "drunks" previous to trial are made. In Boston courts the proportion varies from 14 per cent to 67 per cent, the Boston Municipal being the highest.

The largest number of persons placed on probation are in the age group from 21 to 30 years, 8,367, about 27 per cent of the total.

Out of 1,000 persons convicted of offences, 227 are placed on probation; 84 are sentenced to institutions; 442 pay fines; the cases of 247 are filed without penalty.

There were on probation at the end of the year 2,803 boys, 392 girls, 14,575 men, 1,932 women, a total "population" of 19,702. At the end of 1924, it was 19,562; at the end of 1925, it was 19,215.

STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 1. — CASES PLACED ON PROBATION
Superior Courts

Courts	Total Juveniles		Total Adults		Aggregate
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	7	—	134	17	158
Berkshire	—	—	—	—	—
Essex	—	—	73	4	77
Franklin	—	—	—	—	—
Hampden	22	—	98	14	134
Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—
Middlesex	39	1	301	22	363
Norfolk	2	—	51	5	58
Plymouth	—	—	64	3	67
Suffolk	42	5	811	119	977
Worcester	42	—	161	11	214
Total	154	6	1,693	195	2,048

Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts

<i>Boston</i>					
Boston, Municipal	—	—	2,886	1,044	3,930
Boston, Juvenile	392	136	—	—	528
Brighton, Municipal	26	3	272	26	327
Charlestown, Municipal	34	1	1,106	32	1,167
Dorchester, Municipal	70	3	281	13	367
East Boston, District	141	4	733	55	933
Roxbury, Municipal	196	11	2,417	298	2,922
South Boston, Municipal	72	5	334	36	447
West Roxbury, Municipal	83	2	370	5	460
Chelsea, District	146	12	925	27	1,110
Total	1,160	177	9,318	1,536	12,191
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Central District	131	13	437	24	605
Springfield, District	135	18	398	130	681
Middlesex, First Eastern District	227	4	1,188	22	1,441
Bristol, Third District	155	17	451	91	714
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	124	9	591	51	775
Lowell, District	3	14	586	259	862
Bristol, Second District	149	7	672	77	905
Essex, Southern District	91	6	610	63	770
Lawrence, District	79	5	149	23	256
Total	1,094	93	5,082	740	7,009
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>					
Norfolk, Eastern District	80	3	694	27	804
Somerville, District	172	5	150	16	343
Essex, First District	70	6	329	17	422
Brockton, District	89	4	506	36	635
Essex, Northern Central District	12	1	14	—	27
Holyoke, District	75	9	312	42	438
Hampshire, District	46	1	487	19	553
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	49	4	585	18	656
Berkshire, Central District	21	1	134	5	161
Bristol, First District	21	2	192	7	222
Total	635	36	3,403	187	4,261
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>					
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	32	1	169	16	218
Newton, District	80	—	402	8	490
Fitchburg, District	41	1	284	14	340
Norfolk, Northern District	29	1	76	5	111
Franklin, District	14	4	54	7	79
Worcester, First Southern District	13	—	132	3	148
Brookline, Municipal	51	—	108	4	163
Bristol, Fourth District	15	1	58	7	81
Plymouth, Second District	12	2	140	1	155
Chicopee, District	33	3	92	12	140
Worcester, First Northern District	3	1	72	4	80
Middlesex, First Southern District	38	—	145	8	191
Essex, Eastern District	10	—	87	2	99
Norfolk, Western District	20	3	49	1	73
Middlesex, Central District	31	2	272	10	315
Total	422	19	2,140	102	2,683

TABLE 1.—CASES PLACED ON PROBATION—Continued
Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts—Concluded

Courts	Total Juveniles		Total Adults		Aggregate
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Second Southern District	—	—	28	1	29
Hampden, Weston District	16	3	136	9	164
Berkshire, Northern District*	—	—	—	—	—
Marlborough, District	14	—	117	4	135
Worcester, Second Eastern District	12	—	78	1	91
Newburyport, District	12	3	406	27	448
Plymouth, Third District	5	—	140	3	148
Peabody, District	51	3	301	13	368
Leominster, District	25	—	136	8	169
Worcester, Western District	14	1	61	4	80
Worcester, Third Southern District	11	—	17	—	28
Hampden, Eastern District	5	1	52	2	60
Plymouth, Fourth District	13	1	95	1	110
Norfolk, Southern District*	—	—	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District	2	—	50	—	52
Worcester, First Eastern District	—	—	17	1	18
Berkshire, Fourth District	19	4	355	8	386
Essex, Second District	12	—	116	9	137
Barnstable, First District	13	2	44	2	61
Barnstable, Second District	11	—	18	1	30
Berkshire, Southern District	2	—	19	—	21
Natick, District	12	—	55	3	70
Lee, District	1	—	4	—	5
Hampshire, Eastern District	4	—	10	1	15
Franklin, Eastern District	1	—	4	1	6
Essex, Third District	5	—	37	1	43
Winchendon, District	3	—	5	2	10
Dukes County, District	—	—	—	—	—
Williamstown, District	—	—	47	—	47
Nantucket, District	6	—	5	—	11
Total	269	18	2,353	102	2,742

SUMMARY

Total District Courts	3,580	343	22,296	2,667	28,886
Total Superior Courts	154	6	1,693	195	2,048
Aggregate	3,734	349	23,989	2,862	30,934

* Report not received.

TABLE 2.—CASES PLACED ON PROBATION
Age Distribution

Years of Age	Male	Female	Total
Under 10	252	8	260
10 to 12	970	47	1,017
13 to 14	1,205	99	1,304
15 to 16	1,307	195	1,502
17 to 20	2,799	376	3,175
21 to 30	7,469	898	8,367
31 to 40	6,597	903	7,500
41 to 50	4,410	455	4,865
Over 50	2,714	230	2,944
Total	27,723	3,211	30,934

TABLE 3. — RESULTS OF PROBATION
Superior Courts

Counties	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Disappeared and Defaulted	Case Filed or Probationer Discharged
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	3	10	231
Berkshire	—	—	4
Essex	15	1	97
Franklin	—	—	—
Hampden	5	—	48
Hampshire	—	—	—
Middlesex	68	9	186
Norfolk	—	3	22
Plymouth	6	7	80
Suffolk	116	70	493
Worcester	22	11	134
Total	235	111	1,295

Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts

<i>Boston</i>			
Boston, Municipal	448	1,406	3,346
Boston, Juvenile	34	24	319
Brighton, Municipal	9	47	68
Charlestown, Municipal	86	119	914
Dorchester, Municipal	16	13	450
East Boston, District	15	1	115
Roxbury, Municipal	140	45	1,316
South Boston, Municipal	29	7	329
West Roxbury, Municipal	29	12	230
Chelsea, District	10	—	—
Total	816	1,674	7,087
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>			
Worcester, Central District	99	40	332
Springfield, District	105	42	660
Middlesex, First Eastern District	32	141	1,079
Bristol, Third District	86	52	470
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	27	168	525
Lowell, District	57	2	846
Bristol, Second District	27	47	699
Essex, Southern District	101	26	557
Lawrence, District	6	20	23
Total	540	538	5,191
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>			
Norfolk, East District	14	123	557
Somerville, District	27	88	163
Essex, First District	49	44	427
Brockton, District	156	—	682
Essex, Northern Central District	1	—	5
Holyoke, District	5	—	100
Hampshire, District	14	—	282
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	157	200	826
Berkshire, Central District	24	—	14
Bristol, First District	—	—	—
Total	447	455	3,056
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>			
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	7	10	146
Newton, District	28	67	549
Fitchburg, District	25	17	278
Norfolk, Northern District	9	4	197
Franklin, District	2	—	67
Worcester, First Southern District	9	—	87
Brookline, Municipal	13	10	205
Bristol, Fourth District	—	—	8
Plymouth, Second District	4	—	74
Chicopee, District	20	1	132
Worcester, First Northern District	8	2	69
Middlesex, First Southern District	19	14	136
Essex, Eastern District	19	8	88
Norfolk, Western District	—	—	9
Middlesex, Central District	8	27	301
Total	171	160	2,346

TABLE 3. — RESULTS OF PROBATION—Concluded
Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts—Concluded

Counties	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Disappeared and Defaulted	Case Filed or Probationer Discharged
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>			
Worcester, Second Southern District	5	—	37
Hampden, Western District	20	8	181
Berkshire, Northern District*	—	—	—
Marlborough, District	21	1	102
Worcester, Second Eastern District	13	3	35
Newburyport, District	7	—	9
Plymouth, Third District	2	—	63
Peabody, District	16	46	310
Leominster, District	33	2	222
Worcester, Western District	8	—	44
Worcester, Third Southern District	1	—	18
Hampden, Eastern District	1	—	94
Plymouth, Fourth District	4	5	78
Norfolk, Southern District	5	3	5
Middlesex, First Northern District	—	—	22
Worcester, First Eastern District	—	—	11
Berkshire, Fourth District	—	—	—
Essex, Second District	3	12	79
Barnstable, First District	2	—	48
Barnstable, Second District	3	—	20
Berkshire, Southern District	2	6	17
Natick, District	17	6	129
Lee, District	1	—	11
Hampshire, Eastern District	2	—	14
Franklin, Eastern District	1	—	1
Essex, Third District	—	—	2
Winchendon, District	—	—	7
Dukes County, District	1	—	1
Williamstown, District	2	—	13
Nantucket, District	—	—	11
Total	169	92	1,584
Aggregate	2,143	2,919	19,264

* Report not received.

TABLE 4. — SUMMARY OF PROBATION RESULTS OF ALL COURTS

	Superior Courts	District Courts	Total	Per Cent
Surrendered to the Courts for Violation of the terms of Probation	235	2,143	2,378	9.2
Disappeared and Defaulted	111	2,919	3,030	11.6
Case Filed or Probationer Discharged	1,295	19,264	20,559	79.2

TABLE 5. — PROBATION BY OFFENCES
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted

Offence	Juveniles		Adults		Aggre- gate
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Abandonment	—	—	9	5	14
Abduction	—	—	3	—	3
Abortion	—	—	—	—	—
Abuse of Female Child	3	—	14	—	17
Accessory	—	—	2	1	3
Accosting Person of Opposite Sex	3	—	23	—	26
Act, Unnatural	1	—	7	—	8
Adultery	—	1	101	107	209
Affray	—	—	7	1	8
Appropriation, Unlawful	194	2	175	2	373
Arson	4	1	1	—	6

TABLE 5. — PROBATION BY OFFENCES—Continued
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted—
 Continued

Offence	Juveniles		Adults		Aggregate
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Assault	13	—	78	5	96
Assault, Indecent	12	—	25	—	37
Assault on Officer	—	—	30	1	31
Assault with Dangerous Weapon	5	—	25	3	33
Assault with Intent to Kill	—	—	2	—	2
Assault with Intent to Rob	2	—	3	—	5
Assault and Battery	50	9	556	89	704
Assault to Rape	—	—	1	—	1
Attempt to Commit Crime	—	—	1	—	1
Blackmail	—	—	1	—	1
Rigamy	—	—	1	—	1
Breaking and Entering	765	1	239	3	1,008
Breaking Glass	64	—	56	3	123
Bribery	—	—	4	—	4
Building, Burning	1	—	4	—	5
Burglar Tools, Possessing	—	—	1	—	1
Burglary	—	—	—	—	—
Chastity, Crime against	—	—	—	—	—
Cigarettes, Selling to Minor	—	—	3	—	3
City Ordinance and Town By-Law, Violation of	196	5	458	44	713
Conspiracy	—	—	17	—	17
Contempt of Court	—	—	5	1	6
Cruelty to Animals	1	—	55	4	60
Dangerous Weapon, Carrying	12	—	104	3	119
Delinquency	197	12	9	—	218
Delinquency, Contributing to	—	—	—	—	—
Desertion	—	—	24	2	26
Destitute Parents, Non-support of	—	—	30	4	34
Disorderly Conduct	4	—	16	3	23
Disorderly House, Keeping	—	—	15	26	41
Disturbing Public Assembly	10	—	16	—	26
Disturbing Peace	16	—	285	53	354
Dog, Keeping Dangerous	—	—	2	—	2
Dog, Keeping Unlicensed	—	—	42	3	45
Drug Law, Violation of	—	—	28	11	39
Drunk	44	1	9,438	659	10,142
Exposure, Indecent	4	1	62	2	69
False Pretences	—	—	16	1	17
Fare, Evading	9	3	24	1	37
Fire Alarm, Giving false	32	1	13	2	48
Firearm, Discharging	4	—	13	—	17
Fire, Setting	9	—	15	—	24
Fish and Game Law, Violation of	4	—	109	—	113
Food Law, Violation of	—	—	26	1	27
Forgery	3	1	21	1	26
Fornication	5	11	88	146	250
Gaming	48	—	196	5	272
Gaming on Lord's Day	28	—	15	—	43
Health Regulations, Violation of	—	—	16	—	16
House of Ill Fame, Keeping	—	—	5	11	16
Idle and Disorderly	11	10	69	55	141
Illegitimate Child Act, Violation of	1	—	313	—	314
Kidnapping	—	—	—	1	1
Labor Law, Violation of	—	—	44	—	44
Language, Indecent	—	—	1	—	1
Larceny	1,062	84	1,520	542	3,208
Larceny from Person	—	—	23	1	24
Lewd and Lascivious Cohabitation	—	2	128	171	301
Lewdness	2	7	53	39	101
Liquor Law, Violation of	6	11	2,157	573	2,747
Lodging House Law, Violation of	—	—	6	18	24
Loitering	3	—	22	—	25
Manslaughter	—	—	1	—	1
Medical Law, Violation of	—	—	14	—	14
Milk Law, Violation of	—	—	—	—	—
Mischief, Malicious	34	—	24	2	60
Missile, Throwing	18	—	4	—	22
Misuse of Transfer	—	—	4	—	4
Motor Vehicle Law, Violation of	171	2	2,583	32	2,788
Motor Vehicle, Operating to Endanger Lives	3	—	87	—	90
Motor Vehicle, Operating under Influence of Liquor	—	—	318	1	319
Neglect of Children	4	3	125	28	160
Neglect of Family	—	—	299	3	302
Nightwalking	—	—	1	30	31
Non-support	—	—	2,595	19	2,614
Nuisance	—	—	1	3	4

TABLE 5. — PROBATION BY OFFENCES — Concluded
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted —
 Concluded

Offence	Juveniles		Adults		Aggregate
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Obscene Language	1	—	9	—	10
Obscene Literature	1	—	8	—	9
Park Rule, Violation of	6	—	76	—	82
Perjury	1	—	4	4	9
Police Officer, Assuming to be	—	—	5	—	5
Polygamy	—	—	7	4	11
Police Officer, Refusing to Assist	—	—	1	—	1
Police Officer, Resisting	—	—	4	—	4
Prisoner, Rescuing and Attempted	—	—	7	—	7
Probation and Parole	—	1	4	—	5
Profanity	—	—	15	8	23
Property, Concealing Leased	—	—	18	3	21
Property, Conveying Fraudulently	—	—	5	1	6
Property, Injury to	105	—	111	6	222
Property, Receiving Stolen	29	1	83	13	126
Property, Selling Mortgaged	—	—	11	—	11
Railer and Brawler	—	—	4	7	11
Railroad Law, Violation of	15	—	12	—	27
Rape	2	—	18	—	20
Ride, Stealing	3	—	—	—	3
Robbery	4	—	12	2	18
Runaway	1	19	5	5	30
School Law, Violation of	21	—	40	11	72
School Offender	54	6	1	—	61
Soliciting, Immoral	—	—	3	—	3
Stubbornness	136	125	61	40	362
Sunday Law, Violation of	10	—	52	5	67
Threatening	—	—	45	5	50
Track Walking	11	—	14	—	25
Traffic Law, Violation of	—	2	239	—	241
Trespassing	178	1	102	2	283
Truancy	81	10	2	—	93
True Name Law, Violation of	—	—	5	10	15
Uttering	—	—	1	—	1
Vagabond	—	1	4	1	6
Vagrancy	1	—	53	14	68
Waywardness	5	13	—	—	18
Weights and Measures Law, Violation of	—	—	17	—	17
Total	3,734	349	23,989	2,862	30,934

TABLE 6. — PROBATION POPULATION
Persons Remaining on Probation September 30, 1926

Courts	Boys	Girls	Total Juveniles	Men	Women	Total Adults	Aggregate
<i>Superior</i>							
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	6	—	6	156	15	171	177
Berkshire	4	—	4	6	—	6	10
Essex	1	—	1	164	8	172	173
Franklin	—	—	—	8	—	8	8
Hampden	6	2	8	40	6	46	54
Hampshire	2	1	3	18	2	20	23
Middlesex	47	1	48	560	34	594	642
Norfolk	5	—	5	84	5	89	94
Plymouth	—	—	—	76	4	80	80
Suffolk	37	19	56	1,024	93	1,117	1,173
Worcester	47	—	47	132	15	147	194
Total	155	23	178	2,268	182	2,450	2,628
<i>Boston</i>							
Boston, Municipal	—	—	—	1,743	591	2,334	2,334
Boston, Juvenile	244	119	363	—	—	—	363
Brighton, Municipal	18	5	23	77	9	86	109
Charlestown, Municipal	58	5	63	358	16	374	437
Dorchester, Municipal	30	2	32	199	6	205	237
East Boston, District	73	3	76	281	7	288	364
Roxbury, Municipal	170	11	181	1,216	254	1,470	1,651
South Boston, Municipal	43	2	45	164	11	175	220
West Roxbury, Municipal	55	2	57	36	8	44	101
Chelsea, District	80	17	97	676	25	701	798
Total	771	166	937	4,750	927	5,677	6,614
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>							
Worcester, Central District	113	17	130	195	18	213	343
Springfield, District	217	37	254	564	193	757	1,011
Middlesex, First Eastern District	125	3	128	290	4	294	422
Bristol, Third District	103	12	115	319	72	391	506
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	95	16	111	543	45	588	699
Lowell, District	60	12	72	487	60	547	619
Bristol, Second District	66	17	83	364	56	420	503
Essex, Southern District	60	4	64	228	32	260	324
Lawrence, District	79	5	84	151	22	173	257
Total	918	123	1,041	3,141	502	3,643	4,684
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>							
Norfolk, Eastern District	61	3	64	222	13	235	299
Somerville, District	51	2	53	158	11	169	222
Essex, First District	46	5	51	196	16	212	263
Brockton, District	55	3	58	216	20	236	294
Essex, Northern Central District	3	—	3	5	—	5	8
Holyoke, District	65	9	74	609	45	654	728
Hampshire, District	80	5	85	439	28	467	552
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	32	2	34	216	9	225	259
Berkshire, Central District	24	1	25	154	8	162	187
Bristol, First District	8	2	10	60	10	70	80
Total	425	32	457	2,275	160	2,435	2,892
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>							
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	24	1	25	121	8	129	154
Newton, District	89	10	99	309	30	339	438
Fitchburg, District	25	1	26	65	7	72	98
Norfolk, Northern District	29	—	29	60	7	67	96
Franklin, District	16	1	17	54	3	57	74
Worcester, First Southern District	20	—	20	20	—	20	40
Brookline, Municipal	24	—	24	63	2	65	89
Bristol, Fourth District	2	—	2	35	4	39	41
Plymouth, Second District	4	—	4	64	2	66	70
Chicopee, District	33	5	38	89	14	103	141
Worcester, First Northern District	7	2	9	46	5	51	60
Middlesex, First Southern District	21	—	21	88	2	90	111
Essex, Eastern District	4	—	4	60	2	62	66
Norfolk, Western District	13	—	13	38	1	39	52
Middlesex, Central District	4	2	6	95	5	100	106
Total	315	22	337	1,207	92	1,299	1,636

TABLE 6. — PROBATION POPULATION — Concluded
Persons Remaining on Probation September 30, 1926 — Concluded

Courts	Boys	Girls	Total Juveniles	Men	Women	Total Adults	Aggregate
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>							
Worcester, Second Southern District .	1	—	1	6	1	7	8
Hampden, Western District .	28	9	37	107	14	121	158
Berkshire, Northern District .	2	1	3	11	2	13	16
Marlborough, District .	11	—	11	72	5	77	88
Worcester, Second Eastern District .	9	—	9	54	1	55	64
Newburyport, District .	17	1	18	29	1	30	48
Plymouth, Third District .	13	1	14	21	1	22	36
Peabody, District .	31	2	33	77	6	83	116
Leominster, District .	23	1	24	44	8	52	76
Worcester, Western District .	3	1	4	16	1	17	21
Worcester, Third Southern District .	11	—	11	14	—	14	25
Hampden, Eastern District .	4	3	7	98	6	104	111
Plymouth, Fourth District .	5	—	5	61	2	63	68
Norfolk, Southern District* .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District .	1	—	1	22	—	22	23
Worcester, First Eastern District .	1	—	1	1	—	1	2
Berkshire, Fourth District .	1	4	5	11	—	11	16
Essex, Second District .	13	1	14	156	13	169	183
Barnstable, First District .	20	2	22	40	2	42	64
Barnstable, Second District .	—	—	—	6	—	6	6
Berkshire, Southern District .	4	—	4	8	1	9	13
Natick, District .	9	—	9	25	1	26	35
Lee, District .	—	—	—	11	1	12	12
Hampshire, Eastern District .	4	—	4	7	2	9	13
Franklin, Eastern District .	1	—	1	3	—	3	4
Essex, Third District .	5	—	5	20	1	21	26
Winchendon, District .	—	—	—	1	—	1	1
Dukes County, District .	1	—	1	4	—	4	5
Williamstown, District .	—	—	—	6	—	6	6
Nantucket, District .	1	—	1	3	—	3	4
Total	219	26	245	934	69	1,003	1,248
Aggregate	2,803	392	3,195	14,575	1,932	16,507	19,702

* Report not received.

TABLE 7. — COMPARATIVE DISPOSITIONS

Disposition of Cases after Conviction

Courts	Total Dispositions	Probation	Per Cent	Sentenced to Institutions	Per Cent	Fined and Fine Paid	Per Cent	Filed	Per Cent
<i>Superior</i>									
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	841	158	18.7	209	24.9	334	39.7	140	16.7
Berkshire	35	—	—	21	60.0	6	17.1	8	22.9
Essex	947	77	8.1	303	32.0	231	24.4	336	35.5
Franklin	52	—	—	20	38.5	26	50.0	6	11.5
Hampden	500	134	26.8	94	18.8	93	18.6	179	35.8
Hampshire	109	—	—	27	24.7	70	64.3	12	11.0
Middlesex	2,602	363	13.9	502	19.2	742	28.6	995	38.3
Norfolk	449	58	12.9	88	19.6	210	46.8	93	20.7
Plymouth	581	67	11.5	93	16.0	211	36.3	210	36.2
Suffolk	4,740	977	20.7	1,064	22.4	926	19.5	1,773	37.4
Worcester	1,411	214	15.2	209	14.8	570	40.3	418	29.7
Total	12,267	2,048	16.6	2,630	21.5	3,419	28.0	4,170	33.9
<i>Boston</i>									
Boston, Municipal	18,866	3,930	20.8	2,392	12.7	7,441	39.4	5,103	27.1
Boston, Juvenile	816	528	64.6	74	9.1	54	6.6	160	19.7
Brighton, Municipal	1,782	327	18.3	38	2.2	597	33.5	820	46.0
Charlestown, Municipal	4,425	1,167	26.4	133	3.0	1,824	41.2	1,301	29.4
Dorchester, Municipal	3,056	367	12.0	58	1.9	1,911	62.6	720	23.5
East Boston, District	1,201	933	77.6	23	2.0	19	1.5	226	18.9
Roxbury, Municipal	7,328	2,922	39.8	269	3.7	2,664	36.3	1,473	20.2
South Boston, Municipal	3,935	447	11.3	311	7.9	1,434	36.5	1,743	44.3
West Roxbury, Municipal	3,093	460	14.9	83	2.6	1,478	47.8	1,072	34.7
Chelsea, District	3,400	1,110	32.6	243	7.2	1,662	48.8	385	11.4
Total	47,902	12,191	25.3	3,624	7.6	19,084	39.9	13,003	27.2
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>									
Worcester, Central District	3,794	605	15.9	165	4.4	2,375	62.6	649	17.1
Springfield, District	8,607	681	7.9	354	4.2	6,718	78.0	854	9.9
Middlesex, First Eastern District	2,827	1,441	51.0	75	2.7	944	33.4	367	12.9
Bristol, Third District	2,547	714	28.0	227	8.8	955	37.6	651	25.6
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	6,157	775	12.6	549	8.9	2,139	34.7	2,694	43.8
Lowell, District	2,858	862	30.2	274	9.6	1,099	38.5	623	21.7
Bristol, Second District	2,476	905	36.5	427	17.2	812	32.8	332	13.5
Essex, Southern District	3,537	770	21.7	140	3.9	1,325	37.6	1,302	36.8
Lawrence, District	1,479	256	17.3	294	19.8	702	47.5	227	15.3
Total	34,282	7,009	20.5	2,505	7.6	17,069	49.8	7,699	22.1

TABLE 7. — COMPARATIVE DISPOSITIONS — Concluded
Disposition of Cases after Conviction — Concluded

Courts	Total Dispositions	Probation	Per Cent	Sentenced to Institutions	Per Cent	Fined and Fine Paid	Per Cent	Filed	Per Cent
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>									
Norfolk, Eastern District	3,800	804	21.1	81	2.1	1,931	50.7	984	25.8
Somerville, District	2,436	343	13.9	117	4.7	1,814	73.8	162	6.6
Essex, First District	1,468	422	28.7	461	31.4	368	25.0	217	14.7
Brockton, District	1,676	635	42.8	122	7.2	517	30.8	402	24.5
Essex, Northern Central District	737	27	3.6	84	11.3	438	59.3	188	25.5
Holyoke, District	1,781	438	24.5	156	8.7	1,107	62.0	267	14.9
Hampshire, District	1,211	553	45.7	47	3.8	555	45.7	64	5.2
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	2,242	656	29.2	71	3.1	846	37.6	21	.9
Berkshire, Central District	1,153	161	13.9	72	6.2	516	44.7	66	5.7
Bristol, First District	892	222	24.9	106	11.9	392	43.9	2	.2
Total	17,396	4,261	24.5	1,317	7.6	8,484	48.7	1,134	6.5
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>									
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	1,862	218	11.7	55	2.9	1,035	55.6	16	.8
Newton, District	1,210	490	40.4	42	3.5	467	38.7	4	.4
Fitchburg, District	1,148	340	29.6	54	4.7	294	25.5	27	2.3
Norfolk, Northern District	830	111	13.3	53	6.4	507	61.1	41	4.9
Franklin, District	477	79	16.5	89	18.6	214	45.0	12	2.6
Worcester, First Southern District	712	148	20.7	75	10.5	296	41.6	1	.2
Brookline, Municipal	1,316	163	12.4	22	1.7	532	40.3	11	.8
Bristol, Fourth District	649	81	12.5	47	7.3	417	64.1	18	2.7
Plymouth, Second District	1,167	155	13.3	9	.7	825	70.7	20	1.8
Chicopee, District	840	140	16.6	50	5.9	491	58.6	42	5.1
Worcester, First Northern District	552	80	14.4	35	6.3	365	66.2	6	1.1
Middlesex, First Southern District	820	191	23.3	30	3.6	281	34.3	1	.2
Essex, Eastern District	622	99	15.9	43	6.9	380	61.1	11	1.7
Norfolk, Western District	696	73	10.4	13	1.9	412	59.2	12	1.7
Middlesex, Central District	608	315	51.8	22	3.7	169	27.7	12	1.9
Total	13,509	2,683	19.8	639	4.8	6,685	49.5	234	1.7
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>									
Worcester, Second Southern District	326	29	8.9	23	7.1	248	76.1	12	3.7
Hampden, Western District	883	164	18.6	34	3.8	607	68.8	45	5.1
Berkshire, Northern District	246	—	—	30	12.2	153	62.2	13	5.3
Marlborough, District	322	135	41.9	14	4.3	118	36.7	2	.6
Worcester, Second Eastern District	474	91	19.2	37	7.8	274	57.8	2	.4
Newburyport, District	658	448	68.1	2	.4	124	18.8	4	.6
Plymouth, Third District	457	148	32.4	19	4.2	178	38.9	—	—

Peabody, District	842	368	43.7	89	10.5	241	28.6	4	.4
Leominster, District	484	169	34.9	29	5.9	155	32.1	—	—
Worcester, Western District	423	80	18.9	138	32.6	162	38.4	60	14.2
Worcester, Third Southern District	216	28	12.9	10	4.6	104	48.2	5	2.4
Hampden, Eastern District	348	60	17.3	51	14.6	216	62.0	5	1.4
Plymouth, Fourth District	552	110	19.9	—	—	307	55.7	8	1.5
Norfolk, Southern District	217	—	—	1	.5	199	91.7	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District	358	52	14.6	10	2.7	171	47.7	6	1.7
Worcester, First Eastern District	265	18	6.7	7	2.7	225	84.9	5	1.8
Berkshire, Fourth District	624	386	61.8	16	2.6	168	26.9	3	.5
Essex, Second District	542	137	25.3	32	5.9	298	54.9	6	1.1
Barnstable, First District	461	61	13.3	2	.4	388	84.1	4	.8
Barnstable, Second District	193	30	15.6	6	3.1	113	58.5	4	2.1
Berkshire, Southern District	226	21	9.2	13	5.7	157	69.6	5	2.3
Natick, District	250	70	28.0	13	5.2	81	32.4	2	.8
Lee, District	243	5	2.1	—	—	212	87.3	10	4.2
Hampshire, Eastern District	109	15	13.7	11	10.1	73	67.0	2	1.8
Franklin, Eastern District	98	6	6.1	6	6.1	49	50.1	—	—
Essex, Third District	218	43	19.8	17	7.8	108	49.5	1	.4
Winchendon, District	101	10	9.9	5	4.9	73	72.3	—	—
Dukes County, District	101	—	—	3	2.9	68	67.3	30	29.7
Williamstown, District	86	47	54.7	5	5.8	30	34.9	4	4.6
Nantucket, District	18	11	61.2	2	11.1	5	27.7	—	—
Total	10,341	2,742	26.4	625	6.1	5,305	51.3	1,669	16.2
Aggregate	135,697	30,934	22.7	11,340	8.4	60,046	44.2	33,377	24.7

TABLE 8. — RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS
*Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness) and
 from Jails*

Courts	Persons Arrested for Drunkenness			Prisoners
	Arrests	Releases	Per Cent	Releases
<i>Superior</i>				
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	—	—	—	1
Berkshire	—	—	—	—
Essex	—	—	—	9
Franklin	—	—	—	—
Hampden	—	—	—	4
Hampshire	—	—	—	—
Middlesex	—	—	—	—
Norfolk	—	—	—	—
Plymouth	—	—	—	1
Suffolk	—	—	—	3
Worcester	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	18
<i>Boston</i>				
Boston, Municipal	18,982	12,717	66.9	11
Boston, Juvenile	—	—	—	—
Brighton, Municipal	531	267	50.2	1
Charlestown, Municipal	2,909	411	14.1	9
Dorchester, Municipal	983	454	46.1	1
East Boston, District	3,509	2,189	62.3	12
Roxbury, Municipal	4,447	1,055	23.7	13
South Boston, Municipal	5,664	3,329	52.6	—
West Roxbury, Municipal	1,333	477	35.7	6
Chelsea, District	1,953	318	16.2	7
Total	40,311	21,217	52.6	60
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Central District	4,015	2,314	57.6	9
Springfield, District	1,816	610	33.5	11
Middlesex, First Eastern District	1,627	391	24.0	—
Bristol, Third District	1,234	496	40.1	13
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	3,535	1,288	36.4	—
Lowell, District	2,127	1,159	54.4	50
Bristol, Second District	1,692	879	51.9	17
Essex, Southern District	1,610	620	38.5	1
Lawrence, District	1,582	1,111	70.2	3
Total	19,238	8,768	45.5	104
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>				
Norfolk, Eastern District	1,573	445	28.2	2
Somerville, District	1,413	6	.4	19
Essex, First District	778	467	60.0	21
Brockton, District	1,434	494	34.4	21
Essex, Northern Central District	631	317	50.2	1
Holyoke, District	763	—	—	3
Hampshire, District	621	87	14.0	—
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	1,183	164	13.8	16
Berkshire, Central District	647	117	18.0	—
Bristol, First District	505	212	41.9	—
Total	9,648	2,309	23.9	83
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>				
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	597	140	23.4	13
Newton, District	595	103	17.4	3
Fitchburg, District	807	175	21.6	—
Norfolk, Northern District	392	147	37.5	1
Franklin, District	141	36	25.5	2
Worcester, First Southern District	273	47	17.2	11
Brookline, Municipal	332	5	1.5	—
Bristol, Fourth District	256	34	13.2	1
Plymouth, Second District	606	3	.4	15
Chicopee, District	391	4	1.0	2
Worcester, First Northern District	262	18	6.8	—
Middlesex, First Southern District	273	47	17.2	11
Essex, Eastern District	533	187	35.0	1
Norfolk, Western District	225	—	—	—
Middlesex, Central District	224	—	—	1
Total	5,907	946	16.0	61

TABLE 8. — RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS — Concluded

Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness) and from Jails — Concluded

Courts	Persons Arrested for Drunkenness			Prisoners
	Arrests	Releases	Per Cent	Releases
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Second Southern District	111	—	—	1
Hampden, Western District	365	17	4.6	2
Berkshire, Northern District*	—	—	—	—
Marlborough, District	178	27	15.1	—
Worcester, Second Eastern District	168	9	5.3	2
Newburyport, District	169	14	8.2	4
Plymouth, Third District	128	66	51.5	1
Peabody, District	461	58	12.5	5
Leominster, District	247	7	2.8	4
Worcester, Western District	82	—	—	—
Worcester, Third Southern District	106	28	26.4	—
Hampden, Eastern District	84	14	16.6	2
Plymouth, Fourth District	186	23	12.3	1
Norfolk, Southern District*	—	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District	62	15	24.1	—
Worcester, First Eastern District	33	2	6.0	—
Berkshire, Fourth District	111	43	38.7	—
Essex, Second District	145	48	33.0	1
Barnstable, First District	128	1	.7	1
Barnstable, Second District	1	1	100.0	—
Berkshire, Southern District	71	—	—	—
Natick, District	133	3	2.2	5
Lee, District	39	1	2.5	—
Hampshire, Eastern District	37	8	21.5	2
Franklin, Eastern District	10	—	—	—
Essex, Third District*	—	—	—	—
Winchendon, District	56	3	5.3	—
Dukes County, District	13	—	—	—
Williamstown, District	18	—	—	1
Nantucket, District	2	—	—	1
Total	3,144	388	12.3	33
Aggregate	78,248	33,628	42.9	359

* Report not received.

TABLE 9. — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS

Collections of Moneys under Orders of the Court

Courts	Restitution	Non-Support	Court Expense	Suspended Sentences	Total
<i>Superior</i>					
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	\$3,555 85	\$19,223 50	\$1,055 00	—	\$23,834 35
Berkshire	—	634 50	—	—	634 50
Essex	1,198 50	41,474 06	956 66	—	43,629 22
Franklin	—	30 00	—	—	30 00
Hampden	278 00	5,460 50	182 00	—	5,920 50
Hampshire	75 50	1,831 71	30 00	—	1,937 21
Middlesex	12,756 29	74,731 44	4,923 00	—	92,410 73
Norfolk	1,016 00	10,391 00	90 00	—	11,497 00
Plymouth	1,724 66	9,659 50	174 50	—	11,558 66
Suffolk	41,690 43	154,471 68	6,154 58	—	202,316 69
Worcester	6,647 70	8,595 78	773 63	—	16,017 11
Total	\$68,942 93	\$326,503 67	\$14,339 37	—	\$409,785 97

TABLE 9. — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS — Continued
Collections of Moneys under Orders of the Court — Continued

Courts	Restitution	Non-Support	Court Expense	Suspended Sentences	Total
<i>Boston</i>					
Boston, Municipal	\$20,435 47	\$102,751 64	\$298 21	\$26,328 08	\$149,813 40
Boston, Juvenile	894 61	1,185 50	173 55	—	2,253 66
Brighton, Municipal	1,684 08	19,963 86	—	4,663 50	26,311 44
Charlestown, Municipal	1,535 92	15,631 69	—	6,693 00	23,860 61
Dorchester, Municipal	2,922 70	33,081 03	—	6,126 25	42,129 98
East Boston, District	955 06	12,395 57	—	11,269 00	24,619 63
Roxbury, Municipal	5,156 61	94,893 45	—	28,925 00	128,975 06
South Boston, Municipal	599 35	14,540 08	18,407 50	90 00	33,636 93
West Roxbury, Municipal	879 89	3,940 53	—	6,645 00	11,465 42
Chelsea, District	285 30	9,330 55	15 50	1,690 00	11,321 35
Total	\$35,348 99	\$307,713 90	\$18,894 76	\$92,429 83	\$454,387 48
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Central District	\$1,850 78	\$24,992 14	—	\$3,655 70	\$30,498 62
Springfield, District	8,069 64	67,567 79	\$54 08	14,844 00	90,535 51
Middlesex, First Eastern District	1,853 50	27,006 99	69 63	27,540 79	56,470 91
Bristol, Third District	2,068 47	66,016 20	22 72	3,816 37	71,923 76
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	5,985 01	57,943 29	190 00	11,527 01	75,645 31
Lowell, District	696 51	33,466 28	92 43	3,086 65	37,341 87
Bristol, Second District	2,078 43	26,836 45	133 25	13,407 00	42,455 13
Essex, Southern District	1,640 37	50,032 25	958 25	22,321 79	74,952 57
Lawrence, District	3,137 15	25,652 05	—	725 00	29,514 20
Total	\$27,379 86	\$379,513 44	\$1,520 36	\$100,924 22	\$509,337 88
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>					
Norfolk, East District	\$1,753 50	\$19,846 25	—	\$7,609 93	\$29,209 68
Somerville, District	1,728 07	26,732 76	—	1,925 00	30,385 83
Essex, First District	2,412 38	47,000 57	\$640 32	3,651 00	53,704 27
Brockton, District	882 35	22,604 44	—	6,078 00	29,564 79
Essex, Northern Central District	215 75	7,615 00	—	190 00	8,020 75
Holyoke, District	641 31	14,598 48	—	2,195 00	17,434 79
Hampshire, District	950 00	12,069 13	—	14,240 65	27,259 78
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	67 99	8,286 50	112 01	5,874 50	14,341 00
Berkshire, Central District	2,527 94	11,271 88	—	1,696 50	15,496 32
Bristol, First District	—	10,798 50	—	318 00	11,116 50
Total	\$11,179 29	\$180,823 51	\$752 33	\$43,778 58	\$236,533 71
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>					
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	\$572 69	\$8,593 00	—	\$6,070 00	\$15,235 69
Newton, District	2,448 63	15,305 85	—	6,064 50	23,818 98
Fitchburg, District	524 26	7,993 63	—	4,507 00	13,024 89
Norfolk, Northern District	139 07	8,736 47	—	1,155 00	10,030 54
Franklin, District	—	2,013 00	—	2,730 00	4,743 00
Worcester, First Southern District	6 75	1,644 62	—	—	1,651 37
Brookline, Municipal	3,114 51	8,361 52	—	1,744 30	13,220 33
Bristol, Fourth District	12 00	6,017 50	\$68 70	114 00	6,212 20
Plymouth, Second District	130 59	5,338 04	—	6,169 00	11,637 63
Chicopee, District	274 62	4,450 25	—	415 00	5,139 87
Worcester, First Northern District	464 26	688 37	—	—	1,152 63
Middlesex, First Southern District	825 36	7,518 00	—	1,923 35	10,266 71
Essex, Eastern District	6 38	12,257 65	—	605 00	12,869 03
Norfolk, Western District	—	4,820 60	—	—	4,820 60
Middlesex, Central District	654 00	1,904 35	—	7,749 87	10,308 22
Total	\$9,173 12	\$95,642 85	\$68 70	\$39,247 02	\$144,131 69

TABLE 9. — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS—Concluded
Collections of Moneys under Orders of the Court—Concluded

Courts	Restitution	Non-Support	Court Expense	Suspended Sentences	Total
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Second Southern District	\$70 00	\$554 61	—	—	\$624 61
Hampden, Western District	—	1,694 75	—	\$3,221 00	4,915 75
Berkshire, Northern District	5 00	3,513 00	—	—	3,518 00
Marlborough, District	363 73	2,060 50	—	1,339 00	3,763 23
Worcester, Second Eastern District	60 00	1,211 00	—	—	1,271 00
Newburyport, District	81 50	2,802 00	\$156 00	4,099 05	7,138 55
Plymouth, Third District	209 97	670 01	50 50	2,581 00	3,511 48
Peabody, District	1,166 02	3,589 50	719 00	2,567 00	8,041 52
Leominster, District	34 34	1,964 50	1 75	3,045 00	5,045 59
Worcester, Western District	38 50	1,039 80	—	200 15	1,278 45
Worcester, Third Southern District	104 50	1,255 37	—	—	1,359 87
Hampden, Eastern District	—	886 75	—	58 00	944 75
Plymouth, Fourth District	175 50	4,419 25	—	1,720 00	6,314 75
Norfolk, Southern District*	—	—	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District	37 50	180 00	69 50	805 00	1,092 00
Worcester, First Eastern District	—	99 00	—	1,426 00	1,525 00
Berkshire, Fourth District	83 63	507 00	—	—	590 63
Essex, Second District	64 00	2,633 50	—	1,897 46	4,594 96
Barnstable, First District	—	2,924 61	—	—	2,924 61
Barnstable, Second District	255 00	2,917 00	2,467 60	—	5,639 60
Berkshire, Southern District	186 61	610 00	764 20	—	1,560 81
Natick, District	56 75	2,303 00	—	1,013 00	3,372 75
Lee, District	—	1,005 00	—	—	1,005 00
Hampshire, Eastern District	—	105 00	—	—	105 00
Franklin, Eastern District	—	320 00	—	—	320 00
Essex, Third District	6 00	1,419 00	—	290 00	1,715 00
Winchendon, District	—	504 00	—	301 00	805 00
Dukes County, District	—	191 80	—	—	191 80
Williamstown, District	—	360 00	—	—	360 00
Nantucket, District	14 84	390 00	—	—	404 84
Total	\$3,013 39	\$42,129 95	\$4,228 55	\$24,562 66	\$73,934 55
Aggregate	\$155,037 58	\$1,332,327 32	\$39,804 07	\$300,942 31	\$1,828,111 28

* Report not received.

TABLE 10. — COST OF THE PROBATION SERVICE, YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1926

Counties	Salaries	Pro Tem. Officers	Clerical Assistance	Expenses	Total
Barnstable	\$1,401 72	—	—	\$366 83	\$1,768 55
Berkshire	5,112 99	\$213 72	—	782 25	6,108 96
Bristol	14,092 50	1,032 90	\$3,675 94	1,834 99	20,636 33
Dukes	82 50	—	—	—	82 50
Essex	28,258 34	1,040 94	6,674 00	2,596 76	38,570 04
Franklin	1,680 00	—	—	147 77	1,827 77
Hampden	17,305 94	972 08	5,064 00	1,188 80	24,530 82
Hampshire	2,470 00	174 00	1,196 00	289 93	4,129 93
Middlesex	52,128 64	1,226 47	10,020 61	3,226 83	66,602 55
Nantucket	468 33	—	—	—	468 33
Norfolk	14,239 91	818 99	1,659 98	952 63	17,671 51
Plymouth	7,495 00	285 20	1,629 30	763 68	10,173 18
Suffolk	174,250 58	—	52,150 00	5,838 28	232,238 86
Worcester	17,725 27	1,097 70	4,341 06	465 02	23,629 05
Total	\$336,711 72	\$6,862 00	\$86,410 89	\$18,453 77	\$448,438 38
Commission on Probation	6,980 00	—	13,635 27	5,383 91	25,999 18
Aggregate	\$343,691 72	\$6,862 00	\$100,046 16	\$23,837 68	\$474,437 56

